UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/073,019	05/04/98	KIKINIS	D P1560

LM02/0607

DONALD R. BOYS
PO BOX 187
AROMAS CA 95004

EXAMINER	
DINH,K	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2758	10

DATE MAILED: 06/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/073,019	Applicant(s) Kikinis
	Examiner Dinh Khanh	Group Art Unit 2758

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Mar 30, 2000* .

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire *three* month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Continued Prosecution Patent application filed on 3/30/00. Claims 1-37 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15 and 18-20 are ejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meske et al U.S. pat. No.5,530,852 and in view of Rogers et al. US pat. No.5,701,451.

As to claim 1, Meske discloses the steps of:

accessing a WEB page requested by the customer (user), translating (i.e., converting) the WEB data according to the template and transmitting the translated data to the client device (see col.5 line 58-col.6 line 36), storing the parameters as a template (HTML file, 420 of fig.4) at the Web server (150 fig.2).

Meske does not specifically disclose creating a listing of parameters derived from one or more of hardware or software characteristics of the client device, characteristics of a WEB page, and preferences of a customer using the clients' device. However, Rogers discloses creating a listing of parameters (i.e., Web server processing client's data according to client's parameters, see abstract, fig.1, col.4 lines 40-60, col.6 line 57 to col.7 line 41, col.9 line 56 to col.10 line 11) derived from one or more of hardware or software characteristics of the client device,

characteristics of a WEB page, and preferences of a customer using the clients' device (data according to the database servers 18, see col.9 line 56 to col.10 line 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Roger's teachings into Meske's computer's system to allow users to request information because it would have allowed a user of a client to access and assemble information in multiple platforms at different physical locations more quickly.

As to claim 2, Meske further teaches the parameters include details of a display used by the client device (see fig.8 and col.10 lines 41-64).

Claims 3-5 are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 2.

Claim 6 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1 and 2. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches using tools for altering the characteristics (see col.9 lines 24-48 and col.10 lines 18-40).

As to claim 7, Meske further discloses the editor executing on the client device (see col.3 line 55-col.4 line 12).

As to claim 8, Meske further discloses the editor (user) executes on a WEB server as a part of a WEB page, and is adapted for manipulation by a client accessing the WEB page (see fig.8, col.4 lines 13-51 and col.10 lines 41-64).

Claim 9 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Claim 11 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 9. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches the step of accessing the WEB server by the client device and initiating execution of the Mark-Script (i.e., HTML files to SGML file).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 11.

As to claim 15, Meske further discloses a step for reducing content of pre-fetched WEB pages before transmission to the client device, by consulting parameters based on characteristics of the client device (see col.9 lines 24-48).

As to claim 18, Meske discloses a system for Internet browsing, comprising:

a host computer connected to one or more peripheral devices and to the Internet and a WEB server adapted for browsing the Internet for the host (see 150 of fig.2 and fig.5 and col.6 lines 15-51).

the WEB server fetches WEB pages for the host computer and reduces data content before transmission to the host based on characteristics of one of the peripheral devices connected to the host (see col.6 line 38-col.7 line 18 and col.9 lines 24-48).

As to claim 19, Meske further teaches the WEB server following a script furnished by the host computer for pre-fetching WEB pages and storing them at the WEB server for transmission to the host computer on demand (see col.1 lines 35-57, col.6 line 38-col.7 line 18 and col.9 lines 24-48).

Claim 20 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 19. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches the step of:

a source-side template adapted for converting data requested by the WEB server to an Hyper Text Markup Protocol (HTML) before transmission to the WEB server (see col.5 line 58-col.6 line 37).

3. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meske and Rogers as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Judson U.S. pat. No.5,572,643.

As to claim 10, Meske and Rogers' teachings still applied as in claims 1 and 9 above. Neither Meske nor Rogers teaches refreshing the current Web page. However, refreshing Web page all pre-fetched and stored WEB pages according to the list of WEB pages is generally well known in the art as disclosed by Judson (see abstract, col.2 lines 29-53 and col.5 line 50-col.6 line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Judson's teachings in Meske's network system because it would have enabled the system to update the content Web page into the current state.

Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under the same reasons set forth in claim 10.

As to claim 16, Judson further discloses a step for passing through to a client a request initiated by a pre-fetched page not yet transmitted to the client, either during or after pre-fetch (see abstract and col.3 line 46-col.4 line 24).

As to claim 17, Judson further discloses the request is for one of a security or identification input (see col.2 lines 6-28 and col.6 line 62-col.7 line 17).

4. Claims 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mekse US pat. No.5,530,852 and Rogers as in claim 1 above and further in view of Gleeson et al US pat. No.5,627,829.

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 with the combination of Meske and Rogers. Neither Meske nor Rogers discloses a first set of files is transposed into a first set of files fewer in number than the first set of files. However, Gleeson discloses a first set of files is transposed into a first set of files fewer in number than the first set of files (i.e., compressing and decompressing data) by reducing the size of data packet (see abstract, figs.12A , 12B and col.5 line 63 to col.6 line 56). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Meske with Gleeson's teaching because it would have reduced the number and size of data packets transferred over the wireless network.

As to claims 22 and 23, Gleeson discloses that the second set contains characteristics of the client (see col.6 lines 40-65 and col.col.8 lines 1-44), a single file (see fig.12A and col.15 line 45 to col.16 line 23). Gleeson also discloses saving a copy of transposed data for future communications (see col.16 lines 24-61 and col.col.17 lines 16-48).

As to claim 25, Meske further discloses the server transposes HTML files (see col.4 lines 12-51).

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Claims 27-31 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 21-26 respectively.

Claims 33-37 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 21-24 and 26 respectively.

Other prior art cited

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. Midgdoll et al, US pat. No.5,918,013: Method of transcoding documents in a network environmenmt using a proxy server.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-3817. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-7201.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to response within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C . Sect.133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2758
June 4, 2000.

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER